

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Parent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexaddia, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI FI	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,759 06/27/2003		06/27/2003	Uwe Daemmrich	10191/3140	7177
26646	7590	07/03/2006		EXAMINER	
KENYON ONE PROA		ON LLP	THAI, TUAN V		
ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,		1	2186	
				DATE MAIL ED: 07/03/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/608,759	DAEMMRICH ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Tuan V. Thai	2186	
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c		
- Extension after SIX - If NO per - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Seriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin iiil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication.	
Status				
2a)	esponsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01 Ja</u> his action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This ince this application is in condition for allowan osed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
	of Claims	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 40)3 O.G. 213.	
4)⊠ C 4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)⊠ C 8)□ C	laim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are pending in the application. Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw laim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) <u>1-7,11-18,20,22-29,31 and 33-35</u> is/are laim(s) <u>8-10,19,21,30 and 32</u> is/are objected to laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or papers	re rejected. to. relection requirement.		
10)⊠ Th Aj Re	ne specification is objected to by the Examiner to the drawing(s) filed on 27 March 2006 is/are: applicant may not request that any objection to the deplacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrections on the original process of the content of	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a) [] 1. 2. 3.	cknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau ethe attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)) of References Cited (PTO-892)	A\ ☐ Intocion Suma	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice o	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date 5/2/06.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:		

Art Unit: 2186

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

- 1. This office action is in response to Applicant's communication filed March 27, 2006. This amendment has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 1-35 remain pending in the application.
- 2. The objection to drawing, figure 1 is <u>withdrawn</u> due to the amendment filed March 27, 2006.
- 3. The filing date of the priority document is not perfected since the priority document does not satisfy the enablement and description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because it appears that there are no support in the translated disclosure for the storing of the predefinable information, which is used to transfer the control unit into a defined state, in unused memory areas of the program memory where the computer program is not stored. There is no explicit support for not storing computer program in unused areas of the program memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and

Art Unit: 2186

of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 11 and 23, and their dependents, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. There does not appear to be any support in the original disclosure for the storing of the predefinable information, which is used to transfer the control unit into a defined state, in unused memory areas of the program memory where the computer program is not stored. There is no explicit support for not storing computer program in unused areas of the program memory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a)

Art Unit: 2186

shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-7, 11-18, 22-29 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Von Wendorff (2003/0033562); hereinafter Von.

As per claims 1 and 11, Von teaches the invention as claimed including a device and method for storing a computer program in a program memory 2 of a control unit 1 (e.g. see abstract, figure 1), the method comprises storing the computer program contains instruction according to predefinable rules in specific memory areas of the program memory 2 (e.g. see para.[0027], lines 5 et seq.); and storing predefinable information (special code), which is used to transfer the control unit 1 into a defined (stable) state, in unused memory areas of the program memory (memory section 21) where the computer program is not stored (e.g. see para.[0028], lines 1-7 and para. [0029], lines 1-8);

As per claims 2 and 13, resetting the control unit by executing the predefinable information on a computing unit of the control unit (e.g. see para[0008], lines 5-7);

As per claims 3 and 14, wherein an interrupt service routine is invoked by executing the predefinable information on a computing unit of the control unit (e.g. see para.[0011], lines 10 et seq.; para.[0031], lines 1-6);

Art Unit: 2186

As per claims 4 and 15, wherein an error handling routine is invoked by executing the predefinable information on a computing unit of the control unit (e.g. see para.[0031], lines 3-6; para.[0032], lines 1 et seg.);

As per claims 5 and 16, wherein the control unit is reset at the end of the interrupt service routine (e.g. see para.[0053], and para.[0056], lines 2-7);

As per claims 6 and 17, wherein the predefinable information (special code) is stored in unused memory areas of the program memory (memory section 21) where the computer program is not stored (e.g. see para.[0028], lines 1-7 and para. [0029], lines 1-8);

As per claims 7 and 18, wherein at least one unused memory area of the program memory is completely filled using the predefinable information (special code) (e.g. see para.[0028], lines 1 et seq.);

As per claims 12, wherein the second storing arrangement includes a hexadecimal editor is taught by Von to the extent that is being claimed; for example, the special code that is stored in section 21 together with memory device 2 is cyclic redundancy code or ECC code (e.g. see para.[0028], lines 5 et seq.) which is usually in hexadecimal form; noting that Von also discloses other codes can also be implemented (e.g. see para.[0028], lines 6-7);

As per claim 22, wherein the control unit is reset at the end of the error handling routine (e.g. see para.[0053], and

Art Unit: 2186

para.[0056], lines 2-7);

As per claims 23-29, they encompass the same scope of invention as to that of claims 1-7 and 11, 13-18; the claims are therefore rejected for the same reason as being set forth above.

As per claim 33, wherein the control unit is reset at the end of the error handling routine (e.g. see para.[0053], and para.[0056], lines 2-7);

As per claim 34, resetting the control unit by executing the predefinable information on a microprocessor of the control unit (e.g. see para.[0056], lines 2-7);

As per claim 35, the further limitation of wherein the control unit is reset at the end of the error handling routine is taught as Von, for example, Von discloses that if one or more interrupt service routings by which the device to be controlled is brought into a defined state are erroneous, then a signal is generated, for example, reset a non-maskable interrupt (e.g. see para.[0056], lines 2 et seg.;

Allowable subject matter

8. Claims 8, 10, 19, 21, 30 and 32 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims 1, 11 and 23, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims. Claims 9, 20 and 31 are also allowable since they are depended upon the

Art Unit: 2186

indicated allowable claims.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan V. Thai whose telephone number is (571)-272-41287. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 A.M. to 4:00 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mathew M. Kim can be reached on (571)-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2186

TVT/June 07, 2006

Tuan V. Thai

PRIMARY EXAMINER

Group 2100